



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

b

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,568	07/29/2003	Kevin Baker	742441-2	4119
22204	7590	02/06/2006		
NIXON PEABODY, LLP			EXAMINER	
401 9TH STREET, NW			TRAN, HANH VAN	
SUITE 900				
WASHINGTON, DC 20004-2128			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3637	

DATE MAILED: 02/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/628,568	BAKER, KEVIN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hanh V. Tran	3637	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 November 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is the Final Office Action from the examiner in charge of this application in response to applicant's amendment dated 11/15/2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by USP 3,337,983 to Ebstein.

Ebstein discloses an interlocking component assembly comprising all the elements recited in the above listed claims including, such as shown in Fig 1, a plurality of integral frame and panel components (30,40), with said frame extending about the entire periphery of the panel to form said components, each frame and panel component having a U-shaped channel formed along the entire periphery of said frame and panel component (30,40), wherein during assembly the channel of a frame component is inserted within a channel of another frame component to lock the components together along the length thereof.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Art Unit: 3637

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claims 2-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ebstein in view of USP 5,360,263 to Nakano et al and USP 4,173,379 to van der Heiden et al.

Ebstein discloses all the elements as discussed above including at least one sub-component 50 disposed in the assembly. The differences being that Ebstein does not disclose at least one locking tab disposed within the channel of each component, and at least one aperture disposed within the channel of each component, such that during assembly the channel of a frame component is inserted within a channel of another frame component, the at least one locking tab is received within a corresponding aperture, and the method steps recited in claims 4-6.

Nakano et al teaches the idea of providing an interlocking component assembly, such as shown in Fig 1, comprising a plurality of integral frame and panel components P, each having a channel formed along the periphery of each frame component P, at least one locking tab 10 disposed within the channel of each component, and at least one aperture 20 disposed within the channel of each component, wherein during assembly the channel of a frame component is inserted within a channel of another

frame component, the at least one locking tab 10 is received within a corresponding aperture to lock the components together along the length thereof without the need of employing additional attachment or locking means between the panel components (col. 1, lines 43-48). Van der Heiden et al also teaches the idea of providing an interlocking component assembly comprising a plurality of panels (3,5), each at least one channel formed along the periphery, at least one locking tab 27 and at least one aperture 26 disposed within the channel. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the structure of Ebstein by providing at least one locking tab disposed within the channel of each component, and at least one aperture disposed within the channel of each component, such that during assembly, the channel of a frame component is inserted within a channel of another frame component, the at least one locking tab is received within a corresponding aperture to lock the components together along the length thereof without the need of employing additional attachment or locking means between the panel components, as taught by Nakano et al and van der Heiden et al, since the references teach alternate conventional interlocking component assembly, classified in the same U.S. Classification, thereby providing structure as claimed. In regard to the method claims, since Ebstein, as modified, teaches all the elements recited in said method claims, it is inherent that one skill in the art would be able to perform the steps recited in said claims.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Frydman, Levenberg, Radi, and Schaffner all show structures similar to various elements of applicant's disclosure.
9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh V. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-6868. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, and alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on (571) 272-6867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HVT *HVT*
January 31, 2006

LANNA MAI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Lanna Mai